

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA695623**

Filing date: **09/14/2015**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91223150
Party	Defendant Alvarez, George
Correspondence Address	CHRISTOPHER M. VERDINI K&L GATES LLP 210 SIXTH AVENUE K&L GATES CENTER PITTSBURGH, PA 15222 pitrademarks@klgates.com;christopher.ve
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Christopher M. Verdini
Filer's e-mail	USPTO.LitigationDocket@klgates.com, christopher.verdini@klgates.com
Signature	/Christopher M. Verdini/
Date	09/14/2015
Attachments	Answer_to_Hideawayrivieracancun_com_Trademark_Opposition.pdf(12910 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOLDING ADMINISTRATIVE)	
HOTELIER LIMITED,)	
)	
Opposer,)	
)	
v.)	Opposition No. 91/223,150
)	
GEORGE ALVAREZ,)	
)	
Applicant.)	
)	

APPLICANT’S ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

Applicant, George Alvarez (“Applicant” or “Alvarez”), by his undersigned counsel, hereby answers the allegations set forth in the Notice of Opposition (the “Opposition”) filed by Opposer Holding Administrative Hotelier Limited (“Opposer”) as follows:

1. Applicant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the Opposition and, for that reason, denies them.
2. Admitted.
3. Applicant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the Opposition and, for that reason, denies them.
4. Applicant admits only that the online records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office show that Opposer is the last listed owner of the trademark registration identified in Paragraph 4 of the Opposition. The remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Opposition set forth legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Applicant denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the

Opposition.

5. Admitted.

6. Denied.

7. Applicant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Opposition and, for that reason, denies them.

8. Denied.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

In further answer to the Opposition, Applicant asserts that:

1. Opposer has failed to state a claim, in whole or in part, upon which relief may be granted.

2. Opposer has failed to allege facts sufficient to establish that use and registration of Applicant's mark would create a likelihood of confusion, mistake or deception between Applicant's mark and the Opposer's asserted mark. Among other things, Applicant's mark is not identical or similar to Opposer's asserted mark in sight, sound, appearance or commercial impression, the identified services are not identical, and, to the best of Applicant's knowledge, there have been no instances of actual confusion since Applicant began using its mark in commerce over a year ago.

3. Use and registration of Applicant's mark would not create a likelihood of confusion, mistake, or deception between Applicant's mark and Opposer's asserted mark. Among other things, Applicant's mark is not identical or similar to Opposer's asserted mark in sight, sound, appearance or commercial impression, the identified services are not identical, and,

to the best of Applicant's knowledge, there have been no instances of actual confusion since Applicant began using its mark in commerce over a year ago.

4. Opposer has failed to allege facts sufficient to establish that use and registration of Applicant's mark would falsely suggest a connection with Opposer or its asserted mark. Among other things, Applicant's mark is not identical or similar to Opposer's asserted mark in sight, sound, appearance or commercial impression, the identified services are not identical, and, to the best of Applicant's knowledge, there have been no instances of actual confusion since Applicant began using its mark in commerce over a year ago.

5. Use and registration of Applicant's mark would not falsely suggest a connection between Applicant and Opposer or its asserted mark. Among other things, Applicant's mark is not identical or similar to Opposer's asserted mark in sight, sound, appearance or commercial impression, the identified services are not identical, and, to the best of Applicant's knowledge, there have been no instances of actual confusion since Applicant began using its mark in commerce over a year ago.

6. Opposer will not be damaged in any way by the registration of Applicant's mark.

WHEREFORE, Applicant respectfully requests that the Opposition be dismissed in its entirety, that a Notice of Allowance be issued, and that Applicant be granted such additional relief as the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board may find to be warranted under the circumstances.

Date: September 14, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christopher M. Verdini
Christopher M. Verdini, Esquire
K&L GATES LLP
K&L Gates Center
210 Sixth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
(412) 355-6500 (Telephone)
(412) 355-6501 (Facsimile)

Attorneys for Applicant
George Alvarez

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned herby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served this 14th day of September 2015, via first class mail, postage prepaid, upon the following counsel of record:

Bharati Bakshani
Ladas & Parry LLP
1040 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10018

/s/ Christopher M. Verdini